

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/767.082	01/29/2004	Sang-Boh Yun	678-1283	4590	
66547 The eadbei	7590 02/01/2008	•	EXAMINER		
THE FARRELL LAW FIRM, P.C. 333 EARLE OVINGTON BOULEVARD			BRANDT, CHRISTOPHER M		
SUITE 701 UNIONDALE	. NY 11553		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
0	,		2617		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
	ļ		02/01/2008	PAPER .	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/767,082	YUN ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Christopher M. Brandt	2617	

	Christopher M. Brandt	2617	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>21 December 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS			
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or of this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in complifollowing time periods: 	n the same day as filing a Notice o ving replies: (1) an amendment, aff t ice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in	f Appeal. To avoid at idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	ice, which FR 41.31; or
a) \square The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire late Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(r than SIX MONTHS from the mailing d (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THI f).	ate of the final rejection. E FIRST REPLY WAS F	ILED WITHIN OW
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date been filed is the date for purposes of determining period of extension CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three most patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	and the corresponding amount of the fe statutory period for reply originally set	ee. The appropriate externing the final Office action:	ension fee under 37 or (Se)taksrthin (b)
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in composition of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any expenses a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be AMENDMENTS	tension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e))	, to avoid dismissal of	the appeal.
3. X The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brie	f, will not be entered	because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further co (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet	nsideration and/or search (see NO w);	TE below);	• .
appeal; and/or	to, rolling appeal by materially re	auding or ampinying	
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a €	· -	ected claims.	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1			
1. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		ompliant Amendment	(PTOL -324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)			P
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a	llowable if submitted in a separate,	timely filed amendme	ent canceling
the non-allowable claim(s). For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is profite the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	☑ will not be entered, or b) ☐ w vided below or appended.	rill be entered and an	explanation of
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-4,6-20 and 23-36</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
3. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	ut before or on the date of filing a N d sufficient reasons why the affida	lotice of Appeal will <u>r</u> vit or other evidence i	not be entered s necessary
The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the control	n of the status of the claims after e	entry is below or attac	hed.
 11.	it does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).		
13. Other:	,		
-			
	•		

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)

Continuation of 3. The added limitation raises new issues and requires further consideration and a search e.g. wherein if the mobile station is located in a close area, the base station assigns to the mobile station a channel of a link in the TDD mode, and if the mobile station is located in a remote area, the base station assigns to the mobile station a channel of a forward link in the TDD mode and a channel of a reverse link in the FDD mode. Phillip is discussing a TDD mode and a FDD mode, which is allocated to the terminal in response to at least one criteria relating to the spectral use of the system in order to optimize the spectral ef ficient use of the system by the terminal. However, does not assign channels to a mobile according to the type of location. Therefore, further consideration and a new search is required due to the new limitation of independent claims 1, 12, 17, 26, and 35.

Continuation of 11 does not place independent claims 24 and 25 in condition for allowance because the examiner did address applicant's arguments on page 3 line 12. Independent claims 24 and 25 are similarly to claim 1 because they both pertain to the mobile station and the base station. As the examiner noted in the previous Office Action, Phillip teaches the functionality of claims 24 and 25 as shown through claim 1. Therefore, the examiner grouped these similarly written claims together. As a result, the claims are written such that they read upon the cited reference.

Chris Brandt Art Unit 2617 12/22/2008

WILLIAM TROST
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600